REMARKS

The objections set forth in paragraph 7 have been corrected.

With respect to the provisional obviousness type double patenting rejection, it is respectfully submitted that it is premature to respond until such time as one of the two cases is allowed. Only at that time would the scope of the claims be known and only at that time could a determination be made as to whether a terminal disclaimer will be needed. Therefore, deferral is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 calls for sending a message from a semaphore to control circuitry to execute a thread of instructions to change the state of the thread of instructions from the inactive state in response to a change in conditions.

The cited reference to Kwok teaches a passive semaphore.

The cited reference to Wenniger teaches an active semaphore, but not one that initiates the change of state in response to the change in conditions. To the contrary, in Wenniger, all that happens is that an interrupt is initiated, apparently to indicate a change of conditions. But Wenniger is careful to point out that his interrupt does not enable the thread to then become active. Instead, it must again poll the resource to determine whether or not it can take the resource because it is possible that some other requester obtained the resource. Thus, Wenniger does not teach a system which enables the granting of the resource when it becomes available.

"Even where unique interrupt signals are generated, the receipt of an interrupt signal from a particular resource may not provide a guarantee that a resource will be available at the time the requesting process reattempts to gain control of the resource." See Wenniger at column 6, lines 34-38. Instead, the processor seeking control over the resource 110 initially queries hardware semaphore to determine if the resource is available and if the resource is unavailable, the processor then awaits receipt of an interrupt signal. See column 6, lines 17-22. Thus, it is clear in Wenniger that there is no system to grant the resource to a requester, when the resource becomes available, for example, to the first requester in line.

Claim 1 requires sending a message "to execute the thread of instructions." In contrast, Wenniger sends an interrupt and all the requester can do in response is to again poll for the resource to see if the requester can access it. The thing that went inactive (execution of the thread in the case of the claim or access to the resource in Wenniger) cannot be immediately activated

because Wenniger must re-ask for the resource. Thus, even if Wenniger related to controlling threads, which he does not, the thread could not be activated without still another request for the resource.

Claim 8 further calls for means to send a message from a semaphore to change a state of the thread, in response to a change in one of said conditions. Thus, there is no need for polling after the condition change as there is with Wenniger's interrupt approach. Similar language is found in claims 11 and 15.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

New claims 19-21 further distinguish over the reference. Claim 19 is supported by the specification at paragraph 18. Claims 20 and 21 are supported by the specification at paragraph 39.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 12, 2008

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation